



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/096,593	06/12/1998	STEPHEN D. O'CONNOR	A-64559-3/RT	1989
32940	7590	09/11/2006		
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP 555 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1000 SUITE 1000 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104			EXAMINER COOK, LISA V	
			ART UNIT 1641	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/096,593

Applicant(s)

O'CONNOR ET AL.

Examiner

Lisa V. Cook

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20,22,23 and 30-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20,22,23 and 30-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/27/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment Entry

1. Applicant's response to the office action mailed 25 July 2005 is acknowledged (paper filed 12/27/05). In the response filed therein claim 30 was modified. Claims 1-19, 21, and 24-29 have been canceled. Accordingly claims 20, 22, 23 and 30-36 are pending and under consideration.
2. Rejections of record not reiterated herein have been withdrawn.

OBJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 or applicant on PTO-1449 has cited the references they have not been considered.
4. The IDS filed June 24, 2005 has been considered as to the merits prior to Final Action.
5. The IDS filed December 27, 2005 has been considered as to the merits prior to Final Action.

REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 20, 22-23 and 30-36 are removed from rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has changed the claim language to read on "passivation monolayer" replacing self assembled monolayer (SAM). However, the interchangeable modification of the two terms is not support by the disclosure. The specification implies that the passivation agent is a spacer not a replacement for the SAM. Applicant is invited to show support for the identical definitions of the two terms, "passivation monolayer" and self assembled monolayer (SAM). This is deemed new matter.

Response to Arguments

Applicant contends that it is not proper to inquire whether "passivation agent" as a limitation is interchangeable with "self assembled monolayer" but the appropriate inquiry should be directed to the support of the term "passivation agent" in the disclosure. Applicant further indicated sections of the disclosure that define the term "passivation agent" (page 34, lines 23-25, page 35 lines 28-29, and page 35 lines 35-36). This argument has been carefully considered and found persuasive. Accordingly the rejection is withdrawn.

REJECTIONS MAINTAINED

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 20, 22-23 and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims have been modified to read on a passivation monolayer comprising two covalently attached passivation species and a protein binding ligand. However, Applicant has not cited support for the new claim limitation and examiner was unable to find support. Therein the limitation is considered new matter. Applicant is invented to show support for this limitation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has not shown support for the claims reciting a passivation monolayer comprising two covalently attached passivation species and a protein binding ligand. The disclosure does not appear to support “a passivation agent monolayer comprising at least a covalently attached first passivation species and a covalently attached second passivation species comprising a protein binding ligand”. Therefore the new matter rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 1641

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

I. Claims 20, 30, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze (Metallurgy and Foundry Engineering, 1997, 23(2), 127-137).

Hollis et al. disclose an apparatus (sensor array) meeting the instantly claimed limitation. The apparatus includes a test chamber with an array of first measuring electrodes (test sites), a passivation agent monolayer, a binding ligand covalently attached to the electrode via a spacer, a voltage source and an electronic detector. See abstract, figure 26 A and page 24 lines 5-25 for spacer definition. Ligands useful in this apparatus include proteins (peptides). See page 1 lines 10-13. The test sites are monolithic structures on semiconductor chips or wafers (test chambers).

Art Unit: 1641

Binding of the test sites is measured by two electrodes at each test site. See page 4 lines 5-9 and line 16. The test site may be employed to identify target molecules such as polynucleotides, DNA, RNA, cells, antibodies, or anti-antibodies. See page 8 lines 20-22. Two electrodes at each test site measure the binding of the target to the test site. See page 4 lines 5-9 and line 16.

The test site also includes upper and lower electrodes covered with a film and measures voltages in relationship to target molecule binding, hybridization, or interaction. See page 11 lines 14-32. The sensor array contains binding ligands (such as short oligonucleotide strands) attached to the test site. See page 13 lines 11-21.

The arrays are not limited to only oligonucleotide reagents but can be other ligands to make different probes. The probes can be attached directly to the electrodes or solid support substrates (spacer) via covalent linkage. See page 24 lines 5-25.

In one embodiment the sensor array probes include a passivating layer (passivation agent monolayer). See figure 26 and page 29 line 27-30. The sensors can be evaluated with a microfluidic detector. See page 34-35, for example.

The passivation layer is taught to be useful in increasing the life of the electrode. See page 44 lines 6-9.

Hollis et al. differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching that the passivation layer (passivation agent monolayer) comprises two passivation species.

However, Agladze discloses that passivation films (layers) can modified electrode reactivity reactions via OH ions (species one) and anions (species two). See abstract.

Art Unit: 1641

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the OH ions (species one) and anions (species two) taught by Agladze et al. into the passivation layer apparatus/device of Hollis et al. in order to modify electrode reactivity reactions. See abstract of Agladze. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the electrode reactivity to determine the optimal electrode reaction parameters.

II. Claims 22-23 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze (Metallurgy and Foundry Engineering, 1997, 23(2), 127-137) as applied to claims 20, 30, 34, and 36 above, and further in view of Kayyem et al. (U.S. Patent #6,221,583) and Kossovsky et al. (U.S. Patent #5,585,646).

Please see Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze (Metallurgy and Foundry Engineering, 1997, 23(2), 127-137) as set forth above.

Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) differ from the instant invention in failing to specifically teaching passivation agent monolayer or self-assembled monolayer devices/apparatus including insulators and/or conductive oligomers.

However, Kayyem et al. teach devices which include both insulators and conductive oligomers. Kayyem et al. further disclose that oligomers can exist in the apparatus as an insulator. See column 6 lines 24-57 and column 22 line 66 through column 24 line 42.

While, Kossovsky et al. disclose improved bioelectronics devices in comprising a layer of a polyhydroxy oligomer that is spaced between the surface of a semi conductive material (applicants monolayer) and a electronically active biochemical molecule (applicants binding ligand) which is bound to the semi conductive surface of an electronic device (applicants electrode). The layer of polyhydroxy oligomer functions as a biochemical stabilization layer to prevent denaturization of the electronically active biochemical molecule (Abstract).

The stabilization layer is made up of one or more polyhydroxy oligomers. Exemplary polyhydroxy oligomers include carbohydrates, carbohydrate derivatives, and other macromolecules with carbohydrate like components. Kossovsky et al. further teach that the surface modification concept and the electron donor-acceptor concept can be combined at the semiconductor surface and utilized in various methods.

Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze (Metallurgy and Foundry Engineering, 1997, 23(2), 127-137) – Abstract Only and further in view of Kayyem et al. (U.S. Patent #6,221,583) and Kossovsky et al. (U.S. Patent #5,585,646) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, all the inventions teach the fabrication/utility of electrochemical biosensors.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the insulators and/or conductive oligomers taught by Kayyem et al. and Kossovsky et al. in the apparatus/device of Hollis et al. to perform analyte detection in an affinity assay system because Kayyem et al. taught that insulators serve to inhibit or slow electron transfer (column 24 lines 25-27) and conductive oligomers increase the rate of electron transfer and are more conductive than the insulators (column 6 lines 25-47).

Art Unit: 1641

Further, Kossovsky et al. disclosed that the use of self-assembled monolayer (reading on passivation agents or a type of SAM) allows the molecules to be held in a specific orientation with respect to the metal and are applicable in many system designs (Column 4, Lines 12-25).

recent advances have extended self-assembled monolayer beyond the prototype gold/thiol systems. Fatty acids on aluminum, silanes on silicon, isonitriles on platinum and rigid phosphates on metals are all examples.

Kossovsky et al. also teach the use of the any denaturization of the biochemical material which might be caused by the semiconductor material is eliminated or substantially reduced by placing the stabilization layer of polyhydroxy oligomers between the biochemical material and the semiconductor (Column 7, Lines 13-18).

One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to employ insulators and or conductors (oligomer) to control electron transfer in binding systems like the one of Hollis et al. to ensure optimal working ranges for precise and accurate evaluation of an analyte of interest.

III. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollis et al. (WO93/22678) in view of Agladze (Metallurgy and Foundry Engineering, 1997, 23(2), 127-137) and further in view of Wohlstadter et al. (U.S.Patent#6,090,545).

Please see Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze (Metallurgy and Foundry Engineering, 1997, 23(2), 127-137) as set forth above.

Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze (Metallurgy and Foundry Engineering, 1997, 23(2), 127-137) differ from the instant invention in failing to specifically teach a processor for data analysis in their device designs.

Art Unit: 1641

However, Wohlstadter et al. disclose patterned, multi-array multi-species surfaces on a support (PMAMS) that are electronically excited in electrochemiluminescence (ECL) based tests. The PMAMS can be generated from self- assembled monolayer on a surface. (column 13, lines 10-31). In figure 47 shows an embodiment in which the multi-array apparatus/device includes a microprocessor/computer containing controller means for generating and analyzing ECL signals. See column 7 lines 38-40. The apparatus further provides a voltage source and photon detector. Column 3 lines 59-65 and column 22 Voltage Waveform.

Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze and Wohlstadter et al. (U.S. Patent #6,090,545) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, because the inventions teach the fabrication/utility of electrochemical biosensors.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a processor/computer to analyze the generated device signals as taught by Wohlstadter et al. in the apparatus/device of Hollis et al. (WO 93/22678) in view of Agladze to perform analyte detection because Wohlstadter et al. indicate that "computer controlled voltage systems" are advantageous.

Specifically the computer/processor can be used to select a particular electrical potential or a particular range of electrical potentials over a predetermined time. Column 24 line 63 to column 25 line 5.

One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do this in order to control the device reaction parameters and produce accurate/reproducibly data analyses in rapid time.

Art Unit: 1641

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant argues that it is inappropriate for the Examiner to only cite the abstract of the *Agladze et al.* reference and encloses the full Agladze article as Exhibit A. Examiner thanks Applicant for submitting the full Agladze reference. After carefully consideration of the argument it is noted that Examiner can cite only the abstract when the full document is not available. See MPEP 7-6.02 [R-3] Rejection on Prior Art, Subsection II. Reliance upon Abstracts.... "When both the abstract and the underlying document qualify as prior art, the underlying document should normally be used to support rejection. In limited circumstances, it may be appropriate for the examiner to make a rejection in a non-final Office action based in whole or in part on the abstract only without relying on the full text document. In such circumstances, the full text document and a translation (if not in English) may be supplied in the next Office action." See MPEP § 714.04. The claims may be finally rejected if, in the opinion of the examiner, they are clearly open to rejection on grounds of record.

Applicant contends that Hollis et al. in view of Agladze et al. do not teach the instant invention because the combination does not teach covalent attachment, and "adsorbed" is not "covalent". This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because Hollis et al. teach covalent attachment of reagents to electrodes. See page 24 lines 22-25 for example. While Agladze et al. disclose electrode coating with a passivation agent via adsorption or hydrogen-bonding mechanisms (reading on covalent interactions). See page 132 section 3, for example. The prior art has shown that "adsorption" can produce covalent bounded passivation monolayers. This position is supported by the following abstracts: Kaxiras, Materials Research Society Symposium Proceedings, 1990, 193 (At. Scale Calc. Structure. Mater.), 143-148 and Ohno, Surface Science, 1991, 255(3), 229-236.

Art Unit: 1641

Applicant argues that the rejections are not proper because Hollis et al. do not teach passivation agents. However, this argument has been addressed *a priori*. Hollis et al. disclose sensor array probes including a passivation layer (passivation agent monolayer) on page 29 lines 27-30 and in figure 26.

Applicant also contends that the combination of Hollis in view of Agladze does not teach a second passivation species comprising a protein binding ligand. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because Hollis teaches applications involving protein ligands. See page 1. Hollis also describes devices bounded with various ligands to detect an analyte of interest. See pages 40-42 and Table III.

Further, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of one reference may be bodily incorporated into the other to produce the claimed subject matter but simply what the combination of references makes obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. See In re Bent, 52 CCPA 850, 144 USPQ 28 (1964), In re Nievelt, 179 USPQ 224 (CCPA 1973).

Applicant contends that under 35 USC 103(c) that Kayyem cannot preclude patentability of the presently claimed invention under USC 103. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because the instant application was filed prior to 11/29/00 and the Kayyem patent issued 4/24/01. Accordingly the patent qualifies as prior art under 35 USC 102(e). See MPEP 706.02(I). Common Ownership... "Therefore, the provision of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(1) is effective for all applications pending on or after December 10, 2004, including applications filed prior to November 29, 1999. In addition, this provision applies to all patent applications, including utility, design, plant and reissue applications. The amendment to 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(1) does not affect any application filed before November 29, 1999 and issued as a patent prior to December 10, 2004."

Art Unit: 1641

In response to applicant's argument that Kaymen, Kossovsky, and Wohlstadter are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, all the cited art teach electrode devices having coated materials thereon. The rejections are maintained.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the OH ions (species one) and anions (species two) taught by Agladze et al. into the passivation layer apparatus/device of Hollis et al. in order to modify electrode reactivity reactions. See abstract of Agladze. Agladze also teaches that the modification of the electrode to prevent the possibility of electrode inhibition. See page 132 section 3. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the electrode reactivity to determine the optimal electrode reaction parameters.

Art Unit: 1641

Applicant argues that the device configured in the combination of prior art cited under 35 USC 103 does not provide a reasonable expectation of success for the detection of a protein target analyte. This argument was carefully considered but not found persuasive because it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

10. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1641

12. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1641 – Central Fax number is (571) 273-8300, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. In the event Applicant would like to fax an unofficial communication, the Examiner should be contacted for the appropriate Right Fax number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (571) 272-0823.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Group TC 1600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1641

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Lisa V. Cook
Patent Examiner
Remsen 3C-59
(571) 272-0816
9/1/06



LONG V. LE 09/01/06
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600